

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-21, 32-28 and 41-50 were presented for examination. In an Office action dated September 12, 2007, claims 1-21, 32-28 and 41-50 were rejected. Claim 49 has been canceled. Claims 1, 11, 18, 32, 33, 35, 36, 38, 41, 42 and 43 are amended herein to more distinctly claim Applicants' invention.

Applicants thank the Examiner for examination of the claims pending in this application and address the Examiner's comments below. Based on the above Amendment and following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and withdraw them.

### **Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 102(b)**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5-13, 15, 16, 18, 32-36, 38, 41-47, 49 and 50 under 35 USC § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,576,950 to Tonomura et al. ("Tonomura"). This rejection is traversed.

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

A method, comprising:  
receiving multimedia data by a multimedia *printer* capable  
of outputting a document;  
processing the multimedia data, by the multimedia printer,  
to identify at least one multimedia event in the  
multimedia data and *generate a timeline of the  
multimedia data*;  
associating the multimedia event with a location in the  
timeline; and  
*outputting, by the multimedia printer, a graphical  
representation of the timeline, wherein the graphical  
representation comprises a representation of the at  
least one identified multimedia event.*

This feature of the claimed invention is beneficial because the entire system of processing is contained in a printing device. In other words, a printer is performing the actions of receiving the multimedia data, processing the data, and outputting the data in a printed format. Furthermore, the claimed invention is beneficial because the graphical representation of the multimedia data as a continuous timeline allows for a visual representation of the entire processed piece of the multimedia data, not just the portions where multimedia events have occurred. This allows for identification of other multimedia events that may have occurred in the multimedia data that were not identified by the printer itself.

Tonomura fails to disclose or suggest at least the features of generating a continuous timeline and outputting a graphical representation of the timeline, including a representation of the identified multimedia event. Tonomura merely describes producing an image layout in which events are arranged on the paper from left to right and from top to bottom in the order of time. *See* Tonomura, col. 11, lines 56-60. However, the printed output in Tonomura is not a graphical representation as a continuous timeline and therefore does not include the entire piece of processed multimedia data. As such, Tonomura does not disclose or suggest generating a continuous timeline and outputting a graphical representation of the timeline, including a representation of the identified multimedia event, as recited in claim 1. Therefore, for at least these reasons, the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC § 102(b) based on Tonomura is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 18, 32, 33, 41 and 43 similarly recite generating a continuous timeline and outputting a graphical representation of the timeline, including a representation of the identified multimedia event. All arguments advanced above with respect to claim 1 apply

equally to claim 18, 32, 33, 41 and 43. Furthermore, as claims 2-17, 19-21, 34-38, 42 and 44-50 depend either directly or indirectly from the patentable independent claims 1, 18, 32, 33, 41 or 43 discussed above, all arguments advanced above with respect to independent claims 1, 18, 32, 33, 41 and 43 are hereby incorporated so as to apply to these dependent claims as well. In addition, claims 2-17, 19-21, 34-38, 42 and 44-50 recite other patentable features which further distinguish them from the prior art of record. Applicants submit that dependent claims 2-17, 19-21, 34-38, 42 and 44-50 are patentable over the prior art of record by reason of their dependency, in addition to the further patentable limitations recited therein.

#### **Response to Rejections Under 35 USC 103(a)**

The Examiner rejected claims 4, 14, 17 and 37 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable in view of Tonomura and an article entitled “Pictorial Transcripts: Multimedia Processing Applied to Digital Library Creation,” by Shahraray et al. (“Shahraray”) and also rejected claims 19-21 and 48 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable in view of Tonomura and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0156615 to Strub (“Strub”). This rejection is traversed.

As explain above, independent claims 1, 18, 33 and 43 (the claims from which claims 4, 14, 17, 19-21, 37 and 48 depend), as amended, recite the feature of generating a continuous timeline and outputting a graphical representation of the timeline, including a representation of the identified multimedia event. Tonomura fails to teach or suggest at least these features. Neither Shahraray nor Strub remedy the deficiencies of Tonomura as neither Shahraray nor Strub describe generating a continuous timeline and outputting a graphical

representation of the timeline, including a representation of the identified multimedia event as explained below.

Shahararay does not remedy the deficiencies of Tonomura. As the Examiner has stated, Shahararay merely describes retrieval of video and audio data, processing and outputting the media data in text and pictorial form. Examiner's Office Action, page 9. Shahararay does not describe outputting a graphical representation of multimedia as a continuous timeline as claimed in the present application.

Furthermore, Strub also does not remedy the deficiencies of Tonomura. Strub merely describes processing multimedia for localization. Strub in no way describes outputting a graphical representation of multimedia as a continuous timeline as claimed in the present application.

Applicants respectfully submit that for at least these reasons claims 4, 14, 171 19-21, 37 and 48 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references, both alone and in combination. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner reconsider the rejection, and withdraw it.

### Conclusion

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims now pending are patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons given above, while not necessarily conceding any contention not specifically addressed. Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections of these claims and request allowance of them.

If the Examiner believes that for any reason direct contact with Applicants' attorney would help advance the prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

Respectfully Submitted,  
JONATHAN HULL, et al.

Date: January 14, 2008

By: /Kanda Ishihara/

Kanda Ishihara, Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 56,607  
FENWICK & WEST LLP  
801 California Street  
Mountain View, CA 94041  
Phone: (650) 335-7805  
Fax: (650) 938-5200  
Email: kishihara@fenwick.com